

His distinguished career has been marked by exceptional competence, judgment, objectivity and ability to inspire his associates to their highest capabilities.

CITATION FOR BROMLEY K. SMITH

A skilled and dedicated advisor in the national security field, he has revolutionized the communications system supporting Presidential decisionmaking and action in foreign affairs.

Through rare judgment, energy, and tact, he has generated a steady enlargement of a sense of common purpose among the executive agencies in national security affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

JOURNALISM IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, because of the nature of my remarks, which will be partly a matter of personal privilege, I ask unanimous consent that the rule of germaneness be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the Washington Star for last night, the editor, who has demonstrated in many editorials that I am not one of his favorite Senators, paid his respects to me again. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORSE'S LATEST

It must be that Senator WAYNE MORSE stands on his head when he looks at the international situation. How else explain his persistently upside-down evaluation of what's going on? And how else account for his curiously shallow but vitriolic attacks on American foreign policy?

The latest of these attacks accuses President Johnson of carrying out an illegal and immoral Asian policy "making the United States the world's leading threat to world peace." This is an outrageously irresponsible statement. It does violence to the realities, and it certainly lends more than a little aid and comfort to the Communist enemy in southeast Asia.

It is that enemy, of course, and not the United States, which threatens the peace. Inspired and supported by Red China, the Communists of North Vietnam and Laos are systematically violating solemn international agreements. They are doing so with a merciless campaign of terror and aggression against peoples who want to be free. The ultimate objective is to bring all of southeast Asia under Peiping's totalitarian control.

In helping the free Asians to cope with this threat, our country is serving high principle and its own security interests. Senator MORSE owes an apology to the President and the American people. He has done a gravely obnoxious thing in falsely accusing them, before the whole world, of endangering the peace.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I feel that it is so important that the editorial receive a wider circulation that I am

putting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The American people ought to know the kind of press that is so prevalent in our country, the Washington Star being a good example of the failure of the American press as a whole to live up to the obligations and responsibilities of a free press.

I have said before, and repeat today, that the Washington Star is a newspaper of great irresponsibility. It does not need to come out in yellow paper, although if it were published on yellow paper, it would be a physical picturing of the nature of the journalism of the Washington Star, for it is one of the most vicious newspapers in the country. But there are others. It is always a compliment to me when the editor of the Washington Star writes an insulting editorial about me.

I would know there was something wrong with me if the Washington Star ever found anything about which it could agree with me.

The editorial of last night is going to be answered by the senior Senator from Oregon at this time. It is titled "Morse's Latest." It criticizes me, of course, for my refusal to go along with the unjustifiable killing of American boys in South Vietnam and refusing to go along with the outlawry of the United States in South Vietnam and my refusal to approve of my country's violating one international law obligation after another. That is the great offense the senior Senator from Oregon has committed in the eyes of this yellow journalist who is the editor of the Washington Star. The editorial reads:

The latest of these attacks accuses President Johnson of carrying out an illegal and immoral Asian policy "making the United States the world's leading threat to world peace." This is an outrageously irresponsible statement. It does violence to the realities, and it certainly lends more than a little aid and comfort to the Communist enemy in southeast Asia.

That is an interesting little twist one gets from the McCarthyite editors, Mr. President. If one raises a question of the soundness of the foreign policy of the United States, those editors leave the innuendo and impression that, somewhere, somehow, the one making the statement may be a Red. They do not have the guts to say so directly. That is not the way of the smear artists. They are not honest enough to be direct. It is always called "aid and comfort to the enemy." It is interesting to note that a few weeks ago, the Secretary of State also tried to silence criticism of his Asian policy with the same phrase.

This is not the first time this smear has been hurled at me. In my last campaign in 1962 a libelous book against me was published. It cost \$650,000. It was distributed free to thousands and thousands of voters in the State. It, too, sought to leave the impression that, because the Senator from Oregon does not

believe one pays respect to the flag behind the Presiding Officer's chair by waving it into tatters, his patriotism is suspect.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does not the Senator believe that this is somewhat comparable to the treatment some of us have received in the past when we have tried to cut the foreign aid budget or correct ineffectual programs? Someone has said, "You help the Communist cause when you are trying to get a more effective program."

Mr. MORSE. Of course, that is the outlet of the ignorant. They do not let facts stand in their way. That is the outlet of the ignorance of the editor of the—I was about to say the Washington Post or the New York Times; they are no better. I happen to be replying to the Washington Star today. They do not want any fact to stand in their way. They want to get on a throne of oracism and pontificate, and we are all supposed to bow down and say, "Allah, Allah, Allah."

I was speaking about the libelous book that this type of smear artist published against me in 1962, giving it free to every voter in the State. Its publishers woke up too late, at long last, to discover that they had performed a great service for me, because I was elected by the same percentage of votes that I received in 1956. In 1956 they had followed similar tactics. They never learn. They published a book at that time known as the "Red Book." That was another smear book. The people answered them again. The people of my State are answering them now.

The American policy in Asia cannot be justified on the facts. Its mouthpieces are reduced to justifying it by smear. I say from the floor of the Senate today that the only way it is going to be stopped is by American public opinion. It is too bad we cannot get the facts before the American people. If the American press were not doing a "Pravda" job, if the American press were not, by and large, a kept press, if the American press were not concealing from the American people the facts about American foreign policy, this administration would be hearing more than it is already hearing from the American public, because it is beginning to hear plenty, as I shall show before I am through with this speech.

I have placed in the RECORD on a couple of occasions a large number of letters, telegrams, and other communications I have received from across the country, representing a cross section of the American citizenry, who are as shocked and as much aghast as I am about the illegal war of the United States in southeast Asia.

We do not hear any comment from the editor of the Washington Star about the facts. He talks about my making an outrageously irresponsible statement. He

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

14601

collect calls were placed. Telephone operators stayed with the calls until they located each party including those who had moved to other areas and towns. The operators maintained their superb efficiency throughout the entire period even though several of them could be heard sympathetically sobbing along with the grateful parties on the line. When K7CHG was informed that KL7CPA, an amateur at Good News Bay, Alaska, had burned out his Johnson transmitter power transformer, Harris called Gordon L. Flaten (WOEYMM), service manager of the E. F. Johnson Co. in Waseca, Minn., who quickly airmailed a transformer to Seattle (no charge). Capt. Tony Gomez, pilot for the Pacific Northern Airlines, personally delivered the transformer to Anchorage where he transferred it to the Northern Consolidated Airline for delivery.

K7CHG's station consists of a Johnson Viking 500 transmitter, Hallicrafters SX-101 receiver and Telrex TM-30 beam which is located 62 feet in the air. The first 3 days of operations were conducted between 14.230 megacycles and 14.233 megacycles. On the fourth day, the "Yawn Patrol" net was fully operational and they honored Harris with a spot frequency of 14.235 megacycles on a full-time basis. Some use was also made of the 75 meter phone band during the late hours in order to maintain continuous service.

It is also important to make mention of the numerous local ham neighbors who voluntarily shut down their stations and shared shifts at the Hug household performing all manner of tasks in the interest of "keeping K7CHG on the air." Microphone relief was supplied by Randy Davidson, K7UOE, John Marcinko, W7FHZ, (Mr.) Marion Mety, W7BJG, Bill McCullough, K7OZN, Walt Panchyshyn, K7SNH and Gene Smith, K7HFF.

Sandwiches, coffee, babysitting and all the other chores so essential to a successful operation became a neighborhood project of tremendous magnitude. Harris was not alone but his was the fuel which kept the beacon fire of communications lit. Television and radio stations were phone patched into the amateur station and the actual proceedings were rebroadcast to the entire Seattle area. When propagation conditions permitted, he continued to relay messages and phone patch conversations on a nightly basis for several weeks after the first crisis had been weathered. The good will gained through the unselfish efforts of Harris C. Hug will benefit the amateur radio community for years to come.

I should like to recommend the K7CHG be considered for the Edison or other appropriate amateur award of national stature.

Most sincerely,

JEREMY K. SCHLOSS,
Lieutenant Colonel, U.S. Air Force (Retired), K7ULB.

PRESENTATION OF DISTINGUISHED FEDERAL CIVILIAN AWARDS

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, it was my pleasure to be at the White House on Monday, to witness the presentation by President Johnson of distinguished Federal civilian awards to four outstanding American civil servants. Since then, I have received a copy of the remarks which President Johnson delivered on this occasion, in the flower garden of the White House, and also copies of the citations delivered by Presi-

dent Johnson to John Doar, Herbert Friedman, Lyman B. Kirkpatrick, Jr., and Bromley K. Smith.

I ask unanimous consent to have President Johnson's address and the four citations printed in the body of the RECORD, together with my remarks.

There being no objection, the remarks and the citations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF LYNDON B. JOHNSON, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, UPON PRESENTATION OF THE DISTINGUISHED FEDERAL CIVILIAN AWARDS, IN THE FLOWER GARDEN, THE WHITE HOUSE

Mr. Ball, ladies and gentlemen, this is a very proud moment for those that we have come to honor, and for their families and co-workers as well. It is also a very proud moment for their country. Freedom is much more than merely security against aggression from other countries. Freedom, as our forefathers conceived it, meant the liberation of the individual from oppression by his own government.

Today, after nearly two centuries, the lasting contribution of the American Revolution remains the concept that law is rule, that the people shall govern, that officials of government shall neither rule nor govern, but that officials shall only serve.

Thus, we are honoring the oldest and the noblest tradition of our system, as we honor these four able men for being in every sense faithful servants of our people. In the higher sense, we do much more today than honor fidelity alone. Faithfulness, honesty, and loyalty have so long been the rule of public service in our land that the indirect and isolated exceptions receive and deserve the harshest and strictest censure.

The true purpose of these awards is to challenge the career service to meet the new and highest standards required for this new and changing age. Man's knowledge, man's capabilities, have never advanced so rapidly as in these times. If government does not serve, government becomes only a costly and intolerable disservice unless its departments, its agencies, and its responsible officials strive without ceasing to adopt that advancing knowledge and capacity to the peoples' service. The new standard, the new goal of government, and within government, must, therefore, be the standard goal of excellence.

Each of the public servants that we honor today has in his field contributed a measure of excellence. In so doing, they each epitomize what I believe is a new generation and a new breed of public servant. The day has passed when Government jobs are the easy jobs of our society, or when the public service is the refuge of those inadequate for the demands of private competition. Many of our society's most challenging and most demanding and most difficult and most important posts today are in the public sector. We need for those posts our best minds, our most able men and women. Nothing less, we think, will suffice. These are such men.

So on behalf of a fortunate nation, made stronger by their service, I am proud this morning to salute them and to honor them with this highest award that the Nation can bestow for distinguished civilian service.

Mr. Doar, like all those honored today, has served under administrations of both parties. It is the hallmark of the ideal public servant that he is motivated not by desire to serve a party, but to serve all the people. Mr. Doar has made a basic contribution to our democracy as a vigorous champion of equal voting

rights under the law enacted in 1957. I want to congratulate Mr. Doar especially for the high standards that he has set in its enforcement.

Dr. Friedman's career typifies the new kinds of challenge being offered today within the public service. Back during World War II, one of his inventions permitted a major breakthrough in productivity in the manufacture of radio circuits. I understand the wartime savings in man-hours was more than 50 million, and that this invention is still as valuable now as it was 20 years ago. Dr. Friedman's creativity continues. He holds more than 50 patents, and nearly all of the new information we have accumulated in the past 15 years about the upper atmosphere has come from the experiments Dr. Friedman conceived or designed or executed. I hope that the brilliant and ambitious young scientists of our colleges and universities will keep this in mind when they choose their career courses.

All of us know Lyman Kirkpatrick's remarkable and inspiring story. After a distinguished and brilliant career, he was felled in 1952 by polio. In 1953 he was back at work, travelling around the world as Inspector General of the CIA. His contribution to his country and to the free world has been equalled by few and exceeded by none in the years that he has been restricted by a handicap that many would have regarded as an excuse for simply giving up.

Since this is an election year, I guess I had better not say that Brom Smith is the most valuable man in the White House. But there are some of us here who think that Bromley Smith is a leading candidate for that title.

For more than 10 years he has done a most remarkable job of enabling the Presidency, under three Presidents to be a more responsible and more vigilant and better informed office.

I am personally very grateful and personally very proud of you today.

Now if the recipients would all come around, we will have a picture together, and then we will have them individually with each and their family.

CITATION FOR JOHN DOAR

An exceptionally able attorney, he has significantly contributed to the development and administration of the law in the field of voting rights. By his effective mediation, he has personally secured peaceful progress in human relations.

In a difficult area of Federal-State relations, he has displayed fidelity to democratic ideals, demonstrated courage and understanding and won the confidence of the courts, opposing counsel, and citizens generally.

CITATION FOR HERBERT FRIEDMAN

A brilliant and imaginative research scientist, he has been the originator and leader in the new science of rocket astronomy. His achievements have greatly advanced the Nation's progress in space and extended man's knowledge of the universe.

His fundamental scientific discoveries about the upper atmosphere and the radiations from the sun and the stars are internationally recognized.

CITATION FOR LYMAN B. KIRKPATRICK, JR.

An outstanding administrator and advisor in the field of foreign intelligence, he has been instrumental in achieving notable improvements in the operational effectiveness of the Central Intelligence Agency and the foreign intelligence activities of our country.

1964

14603

talks about my criticizing an illegal and immoral Asian policy. Let the editor of the Washington Star sit down and try to write an editorial justifying the U.S. war in southeast Asia on the basis of international law. Let him try to justify it on the basis of the U.S. Constitution. Let him try to justify it under the United Nations Charter. It cannot be justified on any of those grounds.

The fact is that our President has no constitutional right or power, legally, to send a single American boy to his death in South Vietnam without a declaration of war.

In speech after speech on the floor of the Senate in the past several weeks I have been calling upon my President to send up a declaration of war proposal and let the American public, through their elected representatives in Congress, react to the proposal of war. I have said that if this Congress votes a declaration of war, the senior Senator from Oregon will get behind that declaration of war, because then we must be a united people, and do everything we can to successfully prosecute that war to victory. We would have no other course. But since I first came to the Senate I took an oath at the desk four times to uphold the Constitution, and I do not intend to follow my President, short of a declaration of war, in violation of that oath.

I intend to continue to raise my voice in the interest of peace. I intend to continue to raise my voice, as I said on the "Today" program this morning on NBC television, to try to bring my country back inside the framework of international law—and, I add again today, inside the framework of the Constitution, too.

Let the editor of the Washington Star sit down and write an editorial justifying U.S. action in South Vietnam as a matter of international law. It cannot be done.

The editorial continues:

It is that enemy—

Meaning, of course, the Communist enemy in southeast Asia—

It is that enemy, of course, and not the United States, which threatens the peace.

I do not know where the editor has been. It happens to be the United States that is making use of air power in South Vietnam, bombing and killing. It happens to be the United States, in clear violation of the Geneva accords of 1954 and 1962, that has sent pilots to drop bombs in Laos.

What justification has the editor of the Washington Star for these illegal acts of outlawry on the part of the United States in southeast Asia? I should like to have some evidence that the editor of the Washington Star ever heard about the Charter of the United Nations. I should like to have some evidence that the editor of the Washington Star knows that the United Nations exists. One would not know it from reading the smear editorial that he wrote yesterday

against the senior Senator from Oregon. I should like to have some evidence that the editor of the Washington Star has ever read articles 2, 33, 37, and 51 of the charter, in violation of which the United States stands at the very moment that I speak. In fact, the United States stands in violation, in southeast Asia, of the whole framework, the spirit, the intent, and the purpose of the United Nations Charter.

The United States, I may say for the benefit of the editor of the Washington Star, has set itself up as the guardian, the policeman, and the enforcement officer of the Geneva accord of 1954, which the United States never even signed.

As I said this morning on the "Today" program, Bedell Smith, acting for John Foster Dulles, sat in Geneva as an observer. When the accord was signed by the other signatories, he announced, in behalf of the United States, that we would recognize and respect it as setting forth the principles of international law.

We have not respected it. We have violated it. We put ourselves in the position of a country that did not even sign the accord, taking upon ourselves the prerogative of enforcing it, because, say we, it is being violated by North Vietnam, Laos, and Red China.

I believe that is true. Those vicious Communist countries are violating the Geneva accords of 1954, but so are we. We have already been found guilty of violating the Geneva accords by the Neutral Council, which was established for the very purpose of reporting violations. That Neutral Council, consisting of representatives from Poland, India, and Canada, has found that North Vietnam is a violator of the Geneva accords of 1954, and that South Vietnam is a violator of the Geneva accords of 1954.

It cites, as its evidence that South Vietnam is in violation, the supplying by the United States, in clear violation of the terms of the accords, both of military assistance and military personnel that we have poured into South Vietnam in the past several years.

I believe that one reason why we are leery about going to the United Nations is that we have a good idea as to what the verdict would be.

What else did we do in 1954? The 1954 accord was the accord which partitioned Indochina after France had pulled out because the French people were about to pull down the French Government, and they did. They pulled down a French government because that government had permitted 240,000 French boys to become casualties in a war in Indochina.

The United States poured a billion and a quarter dollars plus into that French war, in trying to help France win it.

Not only that, but, as I have said in past speeches on the floor of the Senate—and I will repeat it for the benefit of the editor of the Washington Star—Dulles went to Europe in 1954 and tried

to persuade the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Winston Churchill, and the Foreign Minister, Anthony Eden, to enter into an agreement between Great Britain and France, whereby, if Great Britain would join the United States in sending American boys and British boys into the Indochina war, perhaps France would stay in it. Once we had obtained that agreement, the news would be broken to the Congress.

One of the most dramatic episodes in history happened at that time. We in Congress were protected, not by our Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, but by the Prime Minister of Great Britain. The response of the Prime Minister of Great Britain was to the effect that that would be practicing a deception on the Congress of the United States. It was old power politics in international affairs: Get a fait accompli and then announce what you have done.

We did something else in 1954 through our Secretary of State that will not read well in the pages of American history in the decades ahead.

We are in grave danger of finding we have secretly been committed to a similar war, this time without any allies at all.

We succeeded in persuading South Vietnam not to sign the Geneva accord of 1954. South Vietnam has never signed those accords. We did something more. Of course, the puppet that the French had been maintaining in Indochina was all through. When the French recognized that, they had to get out. So we set up our own puppet in South Vietnam. This puppet, Diem, who was a creature of the United States, as far as his ruling power in South Vietnam was concerned, was the U.S. police state puppet.

We hear talk about freedom in South Vietnam. There has never been any there. The overwhelming majority of the inhabitants of South Vietnam, illiterate people, would not understand the meaning of the term if it were uttered in their presence. They have been the subjects of a police state tyranny ever since the United States set up its puppet in South Vietnam.

Also, our hypocrisy is well recognized around the world. People talk about freedom in South Vietnam. There is no freedom there, and there has never been any.

Diem did not work out very well. Therefore he was overthrown, and we made certain he was replaced by a similarly pliable tool. His replacement was Minh, a general-dictator. He did not work out very well for us. So we threw in with Khanh, the present military tyrant, the military ruler of South Vietnam. What voice have the people of South Vietnam had in these changes? None whatever. These governments have been imposed on them by the United States.

There is no word about that from the editor of the Washington Star. There

June 25

is no attempt on the part of this yellow sheet to give the facts to the readers of that newspaper about what has happened in South Vietnam. Rather, the attitude is to wave the flag into tatters. Anyone who does not go along with him is supposed to be against the flag.

Mr. President, no combination of yellow journalists in this country is going to close the lips of the senior Senator from Oregon so long as there is any hope of our country following a course of international law instead of American jungle law based upon military right, for it is still jungle law, whether the military might is displayed by the United States or Red Russia or Red China. What I am seeking to do is to bring an end to a resort to the jungle law of military might as the weapon for trying to resolve the crisis in Asia, to avoid being thrown into a major holocaust that would cost the lives of tens upon tens of thousands of Americans boys.

If the Pentagon thinks for a moment that if we begin to bomb North Vietnam, Red China will sit across the border and not fight back, the Pentagon could not be more wrong. The great danger is that we may become bogged down in a war in Asia for years to come if we do not stop this policy.

I am shocked to hear it said—and some say it in private conversations—"Wait. We have nothing to worry about. We can knock out Peiping, we can knock out every population center of China and North Vietnam—and they know it—in a short time with nuclear bombs."

When I hear comments like that—and they are quite prevalent—I wonder what is happening to moral standards in the United States. I wonder what has happened to our morality. I wonder what is happening to our professed about being a Christian nation, because I cannot square that kind of policy with the teachings of my Master. As a Christian, I do not intend to support, on Christian and moral principles, an illegal war in southeast Asia. Rather, I intend to argue, no matter what the castigation and the political consequences might be, that my country should return to the framework of international law. We cannot separate the principles of morality that we expect to govern the personal and private lives of the American people from the policies of their Government.

Whenever the policies of the American Government cannot be squared with moral principles, we are headed for disaster. We shall be headed for disaster in southeast Asia if we follow a course of action that will lead us to an all-out war in Asia—and that is exactly what we are headed for.

What is more, these men who have such confidence in nuclear weapons have not one word about the aftermath. What happens after they have been dropped on China? They do not have any thought of that.

My prediction is that communism as such will be infinitely strengthened in Asia by such a policy. China may be temporarily weakened; but communism in China and throughout Asia will be vastly strengthened.

As I said the day before yesterday, a couple of leading military officials, speaking for our Government in recent days, announced to the world that the United States is ready to take on the risk of war with Red China. I do not know what reprimand those officers have received, or whether the administration knows it is creating the impression that those officers bespeak the policy of the administration; for the policy of this administration, I may say to the editor of the Washington Star, who did not like my use of the word "immoral," is immoral—and it is illegal, too.

Follow a course of action of bombing in North Vietnam and Laos and China, and we will win, for decades to come, the hatred of much of mankind.

Furthermore, the editor of the Washington Star had better consider the alternatives. The Senator from Oregon has been urging not a get-out policy in South Vietnam, but a stay-in policy with allies, to make peace and stop making war. But not a word has been said by the editor of the Washington Star about the SEATO Treaty and the international law obligations that the SEATO Treaty imposes upon the United States. Yes, it is a paper-tiger treaty. As I have said in past speeches, the editor of the New York Times, Mr. Sulzberger, stated one day in one of his columns that in a conference he had with John Foster Dulles in 1955, Dulles explained that the main reason for the SEATO Treaty was to give a legal basis for the U.S. action in South Vietnam; but it did not accomplish its purpose.

As I said the other day, the President of the United States has been quoted to the effect—and I paraphrase him, but accurately—that the only legal basis he needed was SEATO. He had better re-read the SEATO treaty, for it gives him no basis for the course of action he is following in South Vietnam. The SEATO treaty, signed by allies who have walked out on us—Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Thailand, the Philippines, France, and Great Britain—provided a protocol agreement, or in fact had a section that is known in international law as a protocol agreement, in which it was announced that South Vietnam was an area of mutual concern and interest to them. Under international law, such a protocol agreement does not give the United States or any other power the unilateral right to proceed to send in military forces and equipment to make war to enforce the Geneva accord agreements of 1954 and 1962.

Let us look at SEATO. The protocol agreement refers to an understanding among the signatories thereto about mu-

tual concern and interest. I ask the American people: Where are those allies today? Where have they been since American boys began to die in South Vietnam? They have not been with us. The United States has never called upon them to associate in a joint action to keep the peace in South Vietnam.

Oh, yes, there was a meeting of the warmakers in Honolulu some time ago, attended by the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and various other leading American officials. They had a SEATO meeting earlier. But it is interesting to note that out of the SEATO meeting came no agreement for participation by the other countries with us in any operation in South Vietnam. One of the ambiguous, confused general statements of Secretary of State Rusk emanated from that meeting, and it added up to nothing. We stood exactly where we stood before the meeting was ever had; the United States was to function as a unilateral police officer in South Vietnam.

I have said this over and over again, but I shall continue to say it over and over again, because as a former teacher I know the educational value of repetition. When we have a blacked-out press, by and large, except for such outstanding, notable examples at the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, it is necessary to use every medium available to try to get the factual information across to the American people. I have urged from the very beginning that the SEATO nations join us until the United Nations can take jurisdiction. They ought to join us in organizing a peacekeeping corps, not in a warmaking program in South Vietnam. They should join us by contributing substantial forces to maintain peace. We ought to make it clear to both sides that our position is to be a position of neutrality, so far as participating in the war is concerned; and then, under the Articles of the United Nations, file our request with the United Nations that that organization take jurisdiction over the threat to the peace of the world in South Vietnam, and now that it has spread to North Vietnam and Laos, as the additional trouble spot, the threat of full-scale war in southeast Asia.

It has been my position, which I repeat today for the edification of the editor of the Washington Evening Star, that the United Nations would ultimately decide to set up a United Nations trusteeship, or protectorate, for as many years as would be necessary to bring stability to that area of the world, and to help the people develop economic freedom for themselves. Only out of economic freedom can political freedom take root and grow. We cannot implant political freedom first—one of the great failures of America foreign policy in many of the areas of the underdeveloped parts of the world.

But we bring these people to an understanding of the precious values of

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

14605

economic freedom of choice for the individual, we bring to them betterment of the standard of living, betterment of health, betterment of longevity and the betterment of general welfare coincidental to economic freedom; and in not too many years we shall have a free society politically.

The United Nations should follow that course of action. It has the power to follow it. There is nothing novel about that. We are strong for a United Nations peacekeeping force in the Middle East, and we have supported it for some years. We are for sound application of international law. We favor sound substitution of the rule of law for the jungle law of military might.

We look in vain, Mr. President, for any student of the history of the Middle East who would not tell us that if the United Nations had not been in the Middle East for the past several years, that area of the world would have been in outright war. We have not the slightest idea where that would have extended.

We have been strong for the United Nations peacekeeping force in the Congo. It has had its problems and will continue to have its problems. Does anyone have any doubt as to what would have happened in that dark area of Africa if the United Nations had not been there?

When that great world statesman Dag Hammarskjold was Secretary General of the United Nations, and the United Nations first took jurisdiction over the Congo, Russia was in. Russia was about to take over the Congo, and that courageous man, speaking for the United Nations, said to Russia, "Get out, or we will put you out."

Russia got out.

I was one of the delegates, along with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], in the famous shoe-thumping session of the United Nations in 1960. I saw Khrushchev melt under the heat of world public opinion, for he came to that session apparently believing that he could get by with his troika doctrine, and he thought that he could scuttle the position of the United Nations in the Congo. What did he run up against? A unified opinion of the small nations, many of them new members of the United Nations, African states; and delegate after delegate told me this, as I sat for many hours during those weeks of that session and in conferences with delegates from the underdeveloped areas of the world, that they recognized it was the United Nations that stood as the guarantor of their freedom against the threat of Communist takeover.

It is acceptable for the Congo, but not for South Vietnam.

Finally, the United States became interested in Cyprus. That, too, is having its ups and downs. Merely because the

United Nations goes into some area of the world does not mean that it will have fair sailing, with no storms ahead for the United Nations Ship of State. It is sad to contemplate that the United States was first opposed to the United Nations going into Cyprus. It is an interesting paradox and commentary that in that instance—I do not believe it will be true in South Vietnam—but in that instance it was Russia that took the lead to urge that the Cyprus issue be submitted to the United Nations, plus the Premier of Cyprus.

Unfortunately, the United Nations wrote a sad chapter in foreign policy there, in that we wished NATO to take over; because Cyprus is not a member of NATO.

Why NATO should take over, I never was able to understand, because we never got any sensible reasoning out of Secretary of State Rusk as to why that should be our policy. But the United Nations did take over, and it is much better than would have been the case if the United Nations had not done so.

There will be failures in the United Nations, too, but the great failure of the United States at this hour in world affairs is that we have not attempted to get the United Nations to take jurisdiction over the southeast Asia problem.

We have been dragged before the Security Council of the United Nations by that little country Cambodia after the Prince of Cambodia kicked us out, and after we were caught violating the Cambodian border and dropping a fire bomb, or bombs, and burning out a village and killing 16 natives. We were caught because the American plane was shot down and the American pilot was killed. So we quickly apologized. We offered compensation. We were caught. Does anyone believe there would have been an apology if we had not been caught?

I do not know what the facts were, but the Cambodians claimed that that was only one of many violations. Yet not one word was written by the editor of the Washington Evening Star about those ugly facts of American policy.

We have had a clear duty from the beginning to lay before the United Nations the charge of violation of the Geneva accord by North Vietnam and Laos. We have not done so. We have decided to set ourselves up as the determiner of what policy there shall be in South Vietnam. So far as I am concerned, I believe one of the tragedies of our time—and I repeat it, so that the record may be complete today—was that our Ambassador to the United Nations, Adlai Stevenson, lent his lips to reading a speech, obviously written for him at the State Department, in which, in effect, he announced to the world that we were going to do what we pleased in South Vietnam and that the rest of the world could like it, or else.

That was some position for the United States to take.

He sits there, not only as an Ambassador from the United States, but also as one of the trustees of the charter of the United Nations.

If I were Stevenson, I would much rather have sacrificed my Ambassadorship and resigned than to walk out on all the great, eloquent pronouncements Stevenson has made over the years about the importance of the United Nations to maintain peace in the world. But that is done. We have to move on from there.

The point is that any U.N. member at all can seek to bring the issue before the U.N. We run the risk every day of being called to account there, and being compelled to answer the charges of others. I am satisfied that sooner or later we will find ourselves in that situation, unless we first go to the U.N. with our own case and our own proposals.

I wish the editor of the Washington Star would try to write editorials denying those facts of international law and those facts about the ugly record of the United States in violation of the international law in South Vietnam.

The editor continues:

In helping the free Asians to cope with this threat—

Where are these free Asians? Name them. They are subjects of dictatorships. The South Vietnamese are the subjects of a military dictatorship maintained as a United States protectorate in South Vietnam. The editor says:

In helping the free Asians to cope with this threat, our country is serving high principle and its own security interests. Senator Morse owes an apology to the President and the American people. He has done a gravely obnoxious thing in falsely accusing them, before the whole world, of endangering the peace.

May I say to this smear artist who is the editor of the Washington Star that I now incorporate by reference every statement I have ever made in opposition to my country's policy in Vietnam. And I stand on each and every statement. That is my answer to him.

Mr. President, I will continue, as an advocate of the reelection of Lyndon Johnson to the Presidency of the United States, to do all what I can to help him change the course of action—that I think he ought to change—in connection with American foreign policy, and try to get this country to see that before it is too late we ought to get back within the framework of international law, and try to use the rule of law as an instrumentality for preserving peace, rather than to use the military might of the United States to lead mankind further toward the danger of a major war in South Vietnam, North Vietnam and Laos.

If the Chinese do what I think we have every reason to believe they will do if

we carry out the bombing of North Vietnam and Laos—engage in a full scale war in Asia, a war which could not be won without the use of atomic power—then we will be bogged down in Asia for a quarter of a century or longer. Military victories do not produce peace. They can destroy a temporary tyrant. But let us assume a hypothesis that we bomb out North Vietnam, Laos, and China. When we are through with that military victory, will we come home?

Mr. President, we shall have a job then of control, a job of supervision, a job of rebuilding. And we have neither the manpower nor the financial means to carry out what would be clearly our obligation if we were to follow that immoral policy.

I do not intend to let the proponents of American warmaking get away from what I consider to be the foundation of this whole issue as to what our policy should be—the issue of morality.

I think we have a duty as Christians—and when I refer to Christians, I refer also to believers in another faith who believe in one God, those of us who believe in a supreme being—we have a moral, religious duty to try to work out a peace under a rule of law rather than to endanger mankind in a major war.

It is too bad that before the editor of the Washington Star stuck his poison pen into my bloodstream yesterday, he did not read a column that he published in the same issue in which he published his ad hominem argument against the Senator from Oregon, a column by Max Freedman.

I shall read it, not only for the benefit of the Senate, but for the benefit of history. The Max Freedman article lays down the major premises that the Senator from Oregon has been pleading for in the Senate for weeks.

I hope Max Freedman will not find himself in difficulty with this smear editor who operates the Washington Star. But I know Max Freedman to be a courageous journalist who will stand up and be counted for his convictions.

Listen to what he said, Mr. President, in the same issue of the Washington Star in which this yellow journalist, who is the editor of the Washington Star, paid his respects to the senior Senator from Oregon.

The heading of the article is: "The Prospect of War With China—President Urged To Take U.S. People Into Full Confidence in Wake of Threats."

I shall digress from the article from time to time for comment. I ask unanimous consent that when I finish my discussion, the entire article be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. The article reads:

In the past few days, both in Washington and southeast Asia, various spokesmen for the Johnson administration have raised the prospect of a war with China if the Peiping government does not stop making trouble in Vietnam. This kind of threat is more likely

to divide and worry American opinion than it is to frighten Peiping or to serve the cause of peace.

I have been saying that in various word forms for weeks in the Senate.

The article continues:

Although the warning is addressed to China, the real culprit is North Vietnam. Until now, the United States has blamed North Vietnam for the unrest in South Vietnam and Laos. It has acted on the belief that North Vietnam did not wish to be a mere puppet of China.

The interesting thing is that this Communist, tyrannical dictator of North Vietnam has mentioned time and time again that he would like to consider himself another Tito, that he would like to maintain a Communist independence of Red China. I do not know what facts there are that would support that observation.

We all know that when we are dealing with this Communist dictator of Vietnam we are dealing with one of the most able, experienced guerrilla war directors in the world. It was not so many years ago that we were embracing him. It was not so many years ago that we were singing his praises. He was with us against Japan. Times have changed.

Let me make clear, so that no one will try to distort what the Senator from Oregon has just said, that no one could be more opposed to the policies of the dictator of North Vietnam than the Senator from Oregon.

That is why I have been insisting that he ought to be haled before the United Nations. That is why we ought to have been filing our complaint against him long ago for violating the Geneva accord. But I point out that we are not dealing with a dummy—either a dummy from the standpoint of intellect, or a dummy representing Red China. We are dealing with one of the most able Communist leaders in the world—a man well along in his seventies.

I think it is clear that the French have had hopes—and that was the reason for De Gaulle's suggestion to try to reach a negotiated political settlement of the situation in southeast Asia—that the dictator leader of North Vietnam might be persuaded to enter into some kind of a neutralization settlement of the area if it could provide for a guarantee of his independence vis-a-vis Red China.

Why are we not willing to try it? We have not even been willing to agree to a proposal of the French for a 14-nation conference on the problem. We always talk about conditions being attached which we know would make the conference impossible.

The sad fact is that the United States has not been willing to go along with various proposals that would fit into the framework of an international law approach to the problem. Who knows? I do not know what understanding might be reached in an international law procedure settlement with the dictator of North Vietnam. I believe we ought to try. I said that he is in his seventies. What makes anyone think that we are

going to frighten him with American threats of bombing Hanoi?

Today I called for a transcript of a National Broadcasting Co. newscast of last night in which a reporter covering the Pentagon announced that certain points in North Vietnam have been selected for bombing by South Vietnamese pilots flying U.S. planes and if that does not work, by U.S. pilots. This report further reported that the United States will also send troops through Thailand into Laos, if that proves necessary to induce Ho Chi Minh to back down. When I obtain the written text of this report, I shall do my best to find out whether this is in fact why General Taylor is going to the southeast Asia theater of operations.

What are we thinking of if there is any basis in fact for that kind of report? We ought to take the dictator of North Vietnam right before the United Nations, or at least before a 14-nation Conference in regard to southeast Asia, and find out what agreement, if any, can be reached.

People continually say to me, "But we have no assurance that we could reach a settlement with this approach."

Of course, we have not. But we shall never know until we try. We have a moral obligation as well as a legal one to try.

Max Freedman's column, published last night, speaking about North Vietnam not wishing to be a mere puppet of China, continued as follows:

This belief has now collapsed. For it makes no sense at all to think of raids on selected targets in North Vietnam if China's strength has first to be broken before a settlement can be reached.

In all previous discussions, two extreme courses were always excluded from serious consideration. It was assumed that the United States would never run away from Vietnam, nor would it threaten military action against China. For the flimsiest of reasons, and without advancing any proof that the new policy would succeed, these administration leaders have now decided to fling a direct military challenge at China.

Apparently they think they can out-bluff China.

We approach the problem from the standpoint of a Christian-Occidental mind, or from the standpoint of an Occidental mind that believes in God. We are making a horrendous, false assumption if we think, in dealing with the desperate men who rule Red China, that they are going to pay any attention to moral values and that they are going to wither before us and run for cover under our threats. We know that many months ago the Communist leader of China stated in effect that China could sacrifice 400 million human bodies and still survive as a strong country. Exact knowledge of the population of Red China is unavailable, but it is generally agreed by students of China that she has at least 700 million, and probably 800 million inhabitants. She has already demonstrated in past military operations that she places no value on human life as she sends one wave after

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

14607

another wave after another wave of human bodies against an enemy.

Mr. President, when we get into that kind of war with Red China, there will be a shocking reaction around the globe from the standpoint of the morality of it. I believe the Pentagon is making a serious mistake if it thinks it can outbluff Red China by threats of bombing.

Max Freedman's column which appeared in the same issue of the Washington Star as its editorial, raises issues that its editorial totally ignores. But if they had been taken into account, the editorial could not have been written.

His article continues:

How is China to be punished? Presumably not even these advocates of reckless war are in favor of landing American troops in China, though such action may become inevitable if they are allowed to have their way. China cannot be broken by attacks from the sea or by landings from the air. Are we to drop some hydrogen bombs on China? That would at once expose us to the fatal charge that we reserve our most deadly weapons for the people of Asia. This charge would cause us more damage in southeast Asia than the worst defeat we could suffer in Vietnam.

I believe that Max Freedman is unanswerably correct in that observation. I commend him for his journalistic courage in saying so in this hour when the propaganda is to go along as a test of patriotism with an unsound American policy in Asia. Max Freedman continued:

Nor would we have very much help in trying to crush Chinese resistance. Not a single member of the NATO alliance would support this reckless adventure. It does no good rebuking our NATO partners. They see no similarity at all between the Berlin problem and the situation in Vietnam. For many years Berlin has been a common responsibility for the whole alliance. No such shared responsibility has ever been accepted in Vietnam. The political goals sought by the United States may have commanded general agreement but the military burden, in essentials, has fallen on this country alone. So would the agony of a war with China. After Korea it is not permissible for any American to make light of what a struggle with China inevitably means.

But I plead that my Government take to heart the penetrating analysis that Max Freedman just set forth in that paragraph, for we shall be without allies. Our so-called SEATO allies have not lifted a hand, but the State Department is trying to set up a facade, a face-saving rationalization.

As I said on the "Today" telecast this morning on this subject matter, the State Department announced that Australia was going to double her assistance in South Vietnam. Yet when we bored in to find out what that doubling of assistance would be, we discovered that Australia was going to increase its manpower contribution to South Vietnam from 30 to 60 men, but all to be assigned to duty that would keep them far from the battle front, and that in 4 months they thought they might be able to contribute six transport planes to carry material into South Vietnam. How generous of them. But no Australian boys are to die on the battle front—only American boys.

While I am talking about killing in South Vietnam, do not forget that we are killing many innocent, illiterate people, who do not understand what it is all about, many South Vietnamese, many natives in villages. It is a horrible thing, so unnecessary, and so immoral.

The editor of the Washington Star does not like me to use the word "immoral." I can well understand why he would not, because it demonstrates a lack of understanding of the relationship between principles of morality and American foreign policy.

Freedman continues:

Besides, no one can now say with exact knowledge what Russia's role would be in such a struggle. Russia has a treaty to come to the defense of China if China is attacked. This treaty has now been questioned by Russia but has not been repudiated. What right has anyone in Washington to assume that Moscow would do nothing while America lunged at China? This might be the one thing that could still bring Russia and China together in a common policy. Or Russia might go on fresh adventures of her own while America was bogged down in China. Have these risks and dangers been sufficiently weighed by our policymakers?

For weeks I have been making this argument on the floor of the Senate. For weeks I have said that I believe there are two great dangers. One is that our plans to escalate the war into other parts of Asia might very well drive Russia and China back together again. I would like to put Russia on the spot in the United Nations. I would like to find out whether Russia is willing, in the Security Council, to go along with United Nations supervision over the crisis in southeast Asia.

I do not want to follow a course of action that runs the risk I have pointed out, and that Freedman verifies in his column, of possibly bringing Russia and China back together.

The second argument I have made for weeks on the floor of the Senate—which is supported by Freedman in the paragraph I have just read—is that if we become bogged down in Asia, doing Russia's job for her in Asia, if Russia decides on a permanent split with Red China, with our knocking out China by the kind of victory we would obtain with the use of nuclear power, we would weaken our own security thereby and antagonize hundreds of millions of people around the world. Russia would then be free to carry out her Communist designs elsewhere in the world.

I believe that she has not varied one iota from her ultimate intention of communizing the world whenever she thinks she can do it. Make no mistake, the policy of the United States in southeast Asia is an asset to Russia and a threat to the peace of the world. I want to keep Russia in this picture through the United Nations, constantly making her stand up and be counted, within the framework of International law. As I have said so many times, if she vetoes the proposal in the Security Council, we can then go into the General Assembly of the United Nations, as provided for in the procedures of the United Nations.

Freedman continues:

Perhaps this whole effect is simply designed to prove that the Johnson administration can be as tough as Senator GOLDWATER. It had better watch itself or it will merely prove—

And, under the rules of the Senate, I will have to paraphrase—it would merely prove itself to be stupid. Of course, if I said that on my own—and I now associate myself with Max Freedman's comment—the editor of the Washington Star would probably dip his poison pen of yellow journalism into my bloodstream again. Let him do it.

Freedman is so right. He goes on to say:

Not even in his worst moments was John Foster Dulles ever guilty of such a crude and reckless act of brinkmanship as the one into which the Johnson administration has now stumbled.

Only one remedy is left. President Johnson must take the American people into his full confidence. He must be more explicit than he was yesterday. There must be an end to these melodramatic briefings by senior officials who refuse to be quoted by name and who refuse to accept personal responsibility for their provocative statements.

On that point, one of the great journalists of our country called me off the floor of the Senate yesterday and told me about a top secret briefing a number of selected journalists had in the last couple of days by high-ranking officials of the State Department. "But, of course," he said, "our lips are sealed." But he said that what took place will become known and that we can be sure it is known already in the capitals of the world. He said that it is perfectly clear that if the program is not stopped, we are headed straight for a major war in Asia.

I want to read that paragraph of the Max Freedman article again:

There must be an end to these melodramatic briefings by senior officials who refuse to be quoted by name and who refuse to accept personal responsibility for their provocative statements. President Johnson should know that many Americans will recoil in anger and indignation from our present course in Vietnam if it leads to a war with China.

Every time I speak on this subject, it is with a heavy heart, but it is my patriotic duty to plead and plead and plead as long as there is any chance of returning to a policy of the use of international law and of my country's following a peaceful course, and not a warmaking course.

Mr. President, it is easy for the Secretary of State to say: "All that the tyrant in North Vietnam needs to do is to stop annoying South Vietnam."

It is easy for the Secretary of State to say: "All that the Communists in Laos need to do is to stop annoying their neighbors."

The reality is they are annoying their neighbors. The reality is they are violating the Geneva accords. The reality also is, if we can only get our country to recognize that reality, that we should try to press for United Nations consideration. Let us try it. It does not mean that we will move out of South Vietnam. It will mean that there will be a change in strategy. It means, as I have said, that we get our SEATO allies to come in

and help us keep peace until the United Nations decides whether it will or will not do something about it.

People have asked me the question—and they think this is the knockout blow—"But, suppose the United Nations will not come in?" That is an old high school debating tactic. I will answer that question when we find out what the United Nations policy is.

Our policy now ought to be to keep faith with our signature to the United Nations Charter. That should be our policy.

All I can do is call attention to what I consider to be the keen and unanswerable analysis of the southeast Asia crisis by Max Freedman, published in the same issue of the Washington Star in which the editor of the Washington Star tried to draw my blood.

I want the editor to know that I am more healthy, politically and physically, than I was before he wrote his editorial.

EXHIBIT 1

THE PROSPECT OF WAR WITH CHINA—PRESIDENT URGED TO TAKE U.S. PEOPLE INTO FULL CONFIDENCE IN WAKE OF THREATS

(By Max Freedman)

In the past few days, both in Washington and in southeast Asia, various spokesmen for the Johnson administration have raised the prospect of a war with China if the Peking Government does not stop making trouble in Vietnam. This kind of threat is more likely to divide and worry American opinion than it is to frighten Peking or to serve the cause of peace.

Although the warning is addressed to China, the real culprit is North Vietnam. Until now, the United States has blamed North Vietnam for the unrest in South Vietnam and Laos. It has acted on the belief that North Vietnam did not wish to be a mere puppet of China.

This belief has now collapsed. For it makes no sense at all to think of raids on selected targets in North Vietnam if China's strength has first to be broken before a settlement can be reached.

In all previous discussions, two extreme courses were always excluded from serious consideration. It was assumed that the United States would never run away from Vietnam, nor would it threaten military action against China. For the flimsiest of reasons, and without advancing any proof that the new policy would succeed, these administration leaders have now decided to fling a direct military challenge at China.

How is China to be punished? Presumably not even these advocates of reckless war are in favor of landing American troops in China, though such action may become inevitable if they are allowed to have their way. China cannot be broken by attacks from the sea or by landings from the air. Are we to drop some hydrogen bombs on China? That would at once expose us to the fatal charge that we reserve our most deadly weapons for the people of Asia. This charge would cause us more damage in southeast Asia than the worst defeat we could suffer in Vietnam.

Nor would we have very much help in trying to crush Chinese resistance. Not a single member of the NATO alliance would support this reckless adventure. It does no good rebuking our NATO partners. They see no similarity at all between the Berlin problem and the situation in Vietnam. For many years Berlin has been a common responsibility for the whole alliance. No such shared responsibility has ever been accepted in Vietnam. The political goals sought by the United States may have commanded general agreement but the military burden, in essentials, has fallen on this country

alone. So would the agony of a war with China. After Korea it is not permissible for any American to make light of what a struggle with China inevitably means.

Besides, no one can now say with exact knowledge what Russia's role would be in such a struggle. Russia has a treaty to come to the defense of China if China is attacked. This treaty has now been questioned by Russia but has not been repudiated. What right has anyone in Washington to assume that Moscow would do nothing while America lunged at China? This might be the one thing that could still bring Russia and China together in a common policy. Or Russia might go on fresh adventures of her own while America was bogged down in China. Have these risks and dangers been sufficiently weighed by our policymakers?

Perhaps this whole effect is simply designed to prove that the Johnson administration can be as tough as Senator Goldwater. It had better watch itself or it will merely prove that it is more stupid than the Senator. Not even in his worst moments was John Foster Dulles ever guilty of such a crude and reckless act of brinkmanship as the one into which the Johnson administration has now stumbled.

Only one remedy is left. President Johnson must take the American people into his full confidence. He must be more explicit than he was yesterday. There must be an end to these melodramatic briefings by senior officials who refuse to be quoted by name and who refuse to accept personal responsibility for their provocative statements. President Johnson should know that many Americans will recoil in anger and indignation from our present course in Vietnam if it leads to a war with China.

EDUCATION LEGISLATION—IMPACTED AREAS AMENDMENTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to speak on another matter. I owe an obligation to a colleague in the Senate to make this statement.

Mr. President, earlier this year I introduced two bills designed to broaden the scope of the impacted areas statutes, Public Laws 815 and 874. Since that time I have been receiving substantial and increasing support for the concepts contained in those two bills. Therefore, I propose to discuss briefly each of them and to insert into the RECORD certain background data which I believe will be helpful to Senators who have expressed to me their interest in the proposals.

S. 2528, PUBLIC LAW 874, IMPACTED AID EXPANSION

The first measure, S. 2528, if enacted, would add two additional categories of children among those who would be counted in the computation of benefits under Public Law 874. Public Law 874, as it now is written, recognizes the Federal responsibility for financial aid to school districts based upon the number of pupils serviced by those districts whose parents either live or work on Federal property. There are, it is true, certain exclusions from the computation process of the children of certain Federal employees, such as those whose parents are employed by the Post Office Department in the community. This is a separate question not touched upon in S. 2528 but it is a question which I believe, in our hearings on S. 2528, ought to be reexplored by the subcommittee.

The two new categories which would be added to the act under the terms of S.

2528, thus serving to increase the total amounts paid to the school district are: First, those children on whose behalf a parent is receiving an aid-for-dependent children grant; and second, in certain areas of the country which have been certified by the Secretary of Labor as being areas of substantial unemployment, those children whose parents are receiving unemployment compensation benefits.

The logic of the proposed expansion of the act rests upon two propositions. The first is that the children whose parents are receiving an aid-for-dependent-children grant are, in fact, federally connected to a degree approximating the Federal connection of the children whose parents either live or work in the facility serviced by the school district. The Federal Government through its contribution to the family income, is paying for their food, in part, is helping to clothe them in part, and it is paying a share of the rent for the roof over their heads. This is a laudable and necessary expenditure, but the families, by the very nature of their need, are not able to contribute to the local taxes which maintain the local schools, to the same degree as those homeowners who are in higher income brackets. It would seem quite proper, therefore, for the Federal Government, which pays a share of those other costs, to make a direct contribution to the local school district which has the responsibility of providing an opportunity for education to those young people to pay for part of the cost of educating them. Many of them need a type of training which is more costly to the school district than the standard educational program. English, for example, when it is a second language for the child, requires specially trained teachers. Guidance and counseling services in the schools are particularly important if the youngster is to be able to realize his talents.

Since the Federal Government does not bear the sole responsibility, however, the payment proposed is but a fourth of that which it makes in the case of a child whose parents both live and work on Federal property.

The second proposition is that the aid proposed is calibrated in terms of community need; whether it is rural or urban is immaterial; both types of communities would benefit to the degree that the problem, as measured by the number of children in these two categories, exists in that school district. The proposal is not a general Federal aid-to-education-grant concept, much though I should like to see such a program enacted, rather it is pinpointed assistance to those districts most needing help. It is a limited program with a built-in responsiveness to changing conditions—as the need drops the payments drop, as the need increases, the assistance mounts.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks, I ask that there be inserted a table which shows the dollar amounts which would have flowed to the counties of the several States if section 4(A)(1) of S. 2528 had been operative in 1960.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows: